

colony to the ground, where they will lie motionless and quite invisible, so that you had better give up looking for the tricky little creature.

No further observations have been made on the habits of the insect, nor have I even seen the larva or the eggs. So we may still doubt if *Solidago latifolia* be really the food-plant of *Chalepus nervosa*. This question might be elucidated next season, and it would also be interesting to find out what sort of damage the beetle causes to the foliage of this handsome wood Goldenrod.

Blatchley, in his work on the Coleoptera of Indiana, says that *Chalepus nervosa* occurs on weeds and bushes of many kinds. So far, I have not seen the beetle crawling in number over any plant except *Solidago latifolia*.

Is it not strange that the discovery was made only after more than twenty years of very active collecting?

Outremont, Que., Jan. 11th, 1919.

JOS. OUELLET, C.S.V.

### A NEW PARAJULUS FROM BRITISH COLUMBIA.

BY RALPH V. CHAMBERLIN, CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

In a small collection of Chilopods and Diplopods collected by Dr. C. Gordon Hewitt in British Columbia, Sept., 1918, were several specimens of a new species of Parajulus. These were collected at Agassiz. From the same locality were also secured representatives of *Harpaphe haydeniana* (Wood) and *Bothropolys hoples* (Brölemann). A specimen of *Paobius orophilus* Chamberlin, previously known from Kaslo, was taken at Jaspá, Goat Mountain, at an elevation of 7,000 feet.

#### *Parajulus hewitti*, sp. nov.

The general colour of the female is brown above with the sides paler, a series of small, black spots along each side caused by the black repugnatorial



Fig. 21.—*Parajulus hewitti*, sp. n.  
Anterior view of gonopods of male.

glands. The male is darker in colour throughout. The posterior border of metazonites darker down the sides or in the form of an encircling annulus. Anal valves dark. Collum dark along the borders, the remaining portion covered with a dense network of dark lines as is frequent, such also covering the

vertex of the head which is dark excepting the clypeal region. Antennae brown. Legs yellow.

In the male the second tergite extends much below the level of the collum and is angularly produced below at anterior corner. In the male the second tergite is on the same level below as the collum. The collum is more elongate than in the female, as usual, and the longitudinal stria above the lateral border is strongly marked. On each side of the second tergite below are typically three longitudinal striae in the male.

The cardo of mandibles of the male is large. It is concavely excavated below, leaving a larger angular anterior process and a smaller posterior one.

Segmental suture in a well-impressed encircling groove, widely curved opposite the pore from which it is well removed.

Cauda of anal tergite straight, caudally rounded, decidedly exceeding the valves in both sexes.

First legs in male strongly crassate and uncate as usual.

The species is most readily to be distinguished by the structure of the gonopods of the male, particularly by the form of the second pair. These are distally branched, presenting two acute spurs, visible in anterior view, projecting from beneath the plate of the first pair, one of them being apical, and a larger mesal principal branch which curves mesad against the corresponding branch of the other gonopod as shown in the accompanying figure.

Number of segments mostly forty-six or forty-seven.

Length near 27 mm.

---

#### OVIPOSITION OF *RHINOCASTROPHILUS NASALIS* L.

Referring to Mr. A. E. Cameron's article in *Science* for January 3, 1919, p. 26, I would insist that my observations, as recorded in *Can. Ent.* for July, 1918, are absolutely correct. In repeated instances I saw the fly strike at the muzzle of the horse just as I have described. While the egg of *nasalis* is easily to be distinguished from that of *intestinalis*, I still maintain that both are "practically the same size and shape" as compared with that of *haemorrhoidalis*. I also still believe that my tentative conclusions as to the method of oviposition are extremely probable. As to the observations recorded, they are not inaccurate in any sense.

C. H. T. TOWNSEND.